

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 and 25-32 are pending. Claims 1, 6, 11 and 16 are independent claims. No claims have been cancelled. Claims 1, 6, 11, 16, and 25-32 have been amended. By way of these amendments, no new matter has been added. Applicants thank the Examiner for the detailed review of the pending claims.

In the Office Action, claims 1-20 and 25-32 were rejected under both the first and second paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. §112, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement, and as being unpatentable for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. While not acquiescing to the rejections, Applicants have amended the pending application as outlined below to further prosecution. For at least the reasons set forth below, all pending claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. All claim rejections are believed to be addressed herein.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

All pending claims have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, both first and second paragraphs. The rejections all concern the inclusion in independent claims 1, 6, 11 and 16, as well as in several dependent claims, of the term “detranslate,” or variations thereof. The Examiner stated that the term “detranslate,” and associated variations thereof, is indefinite and as such the “claim(s) contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.” Similarly, the Examiner stated that inclusion of the term “detranslate,” and associated variations thereof, caused the claims to be “indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention.” The Examiner further noted “that she is unfamiliar with the use of such a term within the fields of art applicable to the instant application.” (Office Action, Page 6). Applicants believe the rejections are now moot in light of the presently presented amendments.

While Applicants do not acquiesce to the rejections, Applicants have amended claims 1, 6, 11, 16, and 25-32 for clarity in order to further prosecution. Specifically, Applicants have removed instances of the word “detranslate,” and variations thereof, and have replaced the term with “restore,” and appropriate variations thereof. Support for the amendments can be found in the specification at least in paragraphs [0047] and [0048]. Indeed, the Examiner noted that

“Applicant’s arguments seem to rely upon the term ‘restore,’ a term which fails to find itself in any of the claims. If it is the Applicant’s intention to ‘restore’ an address, then the Examiner is of the impression that the claims should state it as such, insofar as it would be clearer to the Examiner and one skilled in the art if Applicant would claim restoring an address to its original form.”

(Office Action, Page 3).

In light of the foregoing amendments, Applicants believe all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants request the claim amendments be entered, the rejections be withdrawn, and the claims be allowed to issue.

It is believed that any fees associated with the filing of this paper are identified in an accompanying transmittal. However, if any additional fees are required, they may be charged to Deposit Account 18-0013, under order number 65632-0534. To the extent necessary, a petition for extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a) is hereby made, the fee for which should be charged against the aforementioned account.

Dated: June 9, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /William J. Halford/
William J. Halford
Registration No.: L0331
Michael B. Stewart
Registration No.: 36,018
RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
Correspondence Customer Number: 25537
Attorneys for Applicant